

# Minutes

# City of Loma Linda

*Department of Community Development*

## Planning Commission

Chair Mary Lee Rosenbaum called a special meeting of the Planning Commission to order at 7:00 p.m., **Wednesday, November 17, 2004**, in the City Council Chambers, 25541 Barton Road, Loma Linda, California.

**Commissioners Present:** Mary Lee Rosenbaum, Chair  
Randy Neff, Vice Chair  
Michael Christianson  
Charles Umeda  
Rene Sakala

**Commissioners Absent:** None

**Staff Present:** Richard Holdaway, City Attorney  
Deborah Woldruff, Director, Community Development  
Rolland Crawford, Director/Fire Chief, Public Safety  
Lori Lamson, Senior Planner  
Jeff Peterson, Associate Engineer, Public Works Department  
Jocelyne Larabie, Administrative Secretary

**Guest:** Lloyd Zola, LSA Associates

### **ITEMS TO BE DELETED OR ADDED**

There were no items to be added or deleted. However, Director Woldruff requested that Item No. 2, Appeal of the single-family residence located on Lawton Avenue, be heard first. Chair Rosenbaum agreed to the change in the order of the discussion items.

### **PC-04-59 - APPEAL OF SINGLE-FAMILY RESIDENCE (SFR) NO. 04-05 - An appeal of the Director's approval of a request to construct a 2,914 square-foot single-family residence on an existing vacant lot. The project is located on a lot west of 24527 Lawton Avenue.**

Planning Technician Allan Peñaflorida reported that the item was an appeal of the Community Development Director's approval of Single-Family Residence (SFR) 04-05 and added that the appeal cited possible drainage issues affecting properties adjacent to the proposed site.

Mr. Peñaflorida explained that on September 27, 2004, a new 2,914 square-foot single-family residence was approved by the Community Development Director on a vacant lot located west of 24527 Lawton Avenue. Ms. Denise Gotta of 24527 Lawton Avenue, located east of and adjacent to the project site, filed an appeal of this decision on October 4, 2004 stating concerns about the increase of water runoff caused from the construction of the new home and the effects of the drainage system to be installed on the subject property.

Mr. Peñaflorida stated that the issues relative to the appeal were addressed through the project design and the conceptual design of the Bela Vista Subdivision (Tract No. 5287), that all elements of the project were consistent with the existing General Plan and appeared to be consistent with the Draft General Plan Update (October 2004). He added that the project was in compliance with the Single-Family Residence (R-1) zoning regulations and that implementation of the Conditions of Approval would ensure that the project complied with all applicable City standards and requirements, and was compatible with the surrounding neighborhood.

In response to questions from the Planning Commission regarding run-off and drainage, City Associate Engineer Jeff Peterson explained that there was a drainage easement which crossed both the Pillar and Gotta properties but the plans showed the run-off continuing into the natural flow channel. He added that the plans indicated an additional easement to the east of the existing one, which would accept the historic drainage, redirect it around the pad of the house and reconnect with the historic path before leaving the applicant's property. Mr. Peterson stated that the applicant had recently submitted a storm plan showing a slightly different alignment, which ended several feet before the property line and spread the water to the historic spread pattern before crossing the property line.

Chair Rosenbaum opened the public comment period at 7:15 p.m.

Mr. Kevin Nick, 24615 Lawton Avenue, Loma Linda, property owner to the east of the subject, wanted to know if the toe of the slope was protected from run-off. Mr. Peterson replied that the work being done on the applicant's property was not close to the toe of the slope.

Denise Gotta, 24527 Lawton Avenue, Loma Linda, Appellant, spoke to the Commission reaffirming her concern regarding the drainage onto her property. She stated that she would like to see the new plans for the drainage pipe because she suspected that the applicant was requesting to remove the drainage easement and adding a two-foot pipe draining at the edge of her property. She added that the applicant was building his property six inches higher, was using the total allowable setback, and was cutting into the bank.

Chair Rosenbaum asked Mr. Peterson about the recently submitted plans and he explained that the latest submittal was a storm drain plan.

Senior Planner Lamson replied that the storm drain plan that Mr. Peterson would be reviewing was subject to the Conditions of Approval and requirements of the Department of Public Works to satisfy those conditions. She added that Ms. Gotta's appeal was for the approval of the house, which must still satisfy the Conditions of Approval and the approval of the Public Works Department.

In order to clarify what the Planning Commission must decide on, Chair Rosenbaum summarized the discussion. She stated that the single-family residence was approved for the location, and the appeal was filed in regards to the single-family residence along with the Conditions of Approval for the project.

Georgia Hodgkin, 24360 Lawton Avenue, Loma Linda, stated that she lived around the corner from the proposed project and pointed out her property was subject to CCRs, which required the lots in the tract to be one acre or more. She added that she wanted to know if the Department ensured that the CCRs were met. Director Woldruff replied that the subject lot was split several years ago, in 1992, recorded, and must have followed the regulations in the CCRs.

Chair Rosenbaum closed the public comment period at 7:26 p.m.

A discussion ensued regarding the easement and the overall drainage issues. Director Woldruff suggested that the plans were available for the Commission's viewing and added that some time could be taken to have Mr. Peterson go over the proposal with the Commissioners. Chair Rosenbaum agreed and the Commissioners stepped away from the dais to review the plans with Mr. Peterson.

Ms. Gotta wanted to make one more remark and commented that the applicant, Mr. John Pillar, had stated that he felt that it was an oversight on the part of the City for not installing the pipe when the lot was subdivided. She added that the City felt at the time that the pipe did not need to be installed until the properties were developed.

The Planning Commission explained that they had a better understanding of the issue of the run-off being diverted around the new structure and then redirected to the historic water flow and would not damage the adjoining properties. Staff emphasized that the applicant would have to satisfy all of the Conditions of Approval before any permits would be issued and that would include any condition the Public Works Department would add to appropriately address the issue of the drainage.

**Motion by Christianson, seconded by Neff, and unanimously carried to deny the appeal and uphold Staff's approval of the Single-Family Residence (SFR) No. 04-05 subject to the Conditions of Approval.**

Director Woldruff stated to the Planning Commission that staff would continue to work closely with the applicant and Ms. Gotta to ensure that the project moved smoothly through the process.

**PC-04-60 - GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT (GPA) NO. 04-03, ZONE CHANGE (ZC) NO. 04-03, TENTATIVE TRACT MAP (TTM) NO. 16811, PRECISE PLAN OF DESIGN (PPD) NO. 04-04, AND DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT - A proposal to change the general plan land use plan and zoning maps from professional office and administrative professional to mixed-use and planned community to accommodate a 30-lot subdivision on approximately 3.0 acres of land located at the southwest corner of orange avenue and new jersey street. the project includes requests for approval of the proposed housing designs and a development agreement to address the city's affordable housing requirements.**

Assistant Planner Colunga reported that the item was a continued item from the October 6, 2004 Planning Commission meeting. He continued to say that the proposal was for 30 single-family residences on three acres at the southwest corner of Orange Avenue and New Jersey Street and that the applicant was requesting a General Plan Amendment, Zone Change, Tentative Tract Map, Precise Plan of Design and a Development Agreement.

Mr. Colunga explained that, at the November 10, 2004 meeting, the Planning Commission voted to designate the subject 3-acre parcel, located in Special Planning Area "G", within the draft General Plan Land Use Element, as "Professional Office". He added that the proposed designations for the remaining acreage would include a commercial designation at the north east corner of Barton Road and California Street, high density for the Barton Vineyard project on the south east corner of Orange Avenue and California Street, the Filipino Seventh Day Adventist Church on the north east corner of Orange Avenue and California Street, and professional office for at the northeast corner of Barton Road and New Jersey Street.

Mr. Colunga indicated that the applicant had provided a letter from Ruthann Lehrer dated November 11, 2004 and one letter from Terry Smith of KTK Construction dated November 17, 2004.

Mr. Colunga explained that if the Planning Commission decided to deny the project based on the direction given at the November 10, 2004 meeting for Special Planning Area "G", it was staff's recommendation that the denial be without prejudice.

Attorney Holdaway explained that the applicant could resubmit his application without additional application fees. Director Woldruff added that if the General Plan Amendment or Zone Change were denied at the Planning Commission level, the application would need to be appealed to the City Council whereas if the requests were approved the project would automatically go forward to City Council.

Chair Rosenbaum opened the public comment period at 7:45 p.m.

Terry Smith, 18627 Brookhurst Street, Fountain Valley CA, applicant, explained that he wanted to go on the record regarding the reasons for his request for a Zone Change. He commented that 100% of the property around his parcel was zoned medium to high density, 9 to 13 du/acre. He added that the rezoning of a 22-acre parcel on the corner of Orange Avenue and California Street to high-density residential had already occurred and he continued to compare the density and the traffic related to that and other properties in the vicinity to his own parcel on the Corner of Orange Avenue and New Jersey Street.

Paul Hsu, 20151 Seal Point Lane, Huntington Beach CA, stated that he was speaking in favor of the project, his neighbor to the south. He added that he attended the City Council meeting on the November 16, 2004 where the Council discussed the Economic Development Element of the Draft General Plan and the Council stated that the City of Loma Linda offered more high-end jobs than any other city in the Inland Empire and that they expected that trend to continue for several years. Mr. Hsu continued by stating that if the land designation was maintained as a Professional Office designation, the resulting project would bring in much more traffic, pollution, noise than a smaller residential project would. He concluded his statement by urging the Planning Commission to approve this project, Tentative Tract Map (TTM) 16811.

Chair Rosenbaum closed the public comment at 7:50 p.m.

Vice Chair Neff stated that his concerns were similar to Mr. Hsu's in regards to traffic and affordable housing. He added that one way to reduce traffic was to provide jobs and housing in the City of Loma Linda, stressing that a commercial site would not solve the City's need for housing. He concluded stating that he was in favor of allowing a housing project to be built.

Commissioner Umeda motioned to deny, with the following findings: 1) the project went before the Historical Commission on August 2, 2004 and it was given a negative recommendation by the Commission; 2) the Planning Commission reviewed the area in the discussion of the Draft General Plan, and by a 3-2 vote changed the zoning designation to Professional Offices.

Director Woldruff commented that staff had provided specific findings for the General Plan Amendment, the Zone Change and the different application components and added that although Commissioner Umeda's findings were reasons for not approving the project, the motion should relate to the findings for this specific project.

Chair Rosenbaum called for a brief recess to allow Director Woldruff the time to make copies of the findings provided in the Staff Report of October 6, 2004 meeting for the members of the Planning Commission.

Attorney Holdaway explained that the Planning Commission's role in some actions was advisory to the City Council and in this case, Item 3, The Development Agreement and Item 4, Tentative Tract Map No. 16811 and Precise Plan of Design PPD No. 04-04 were of an advisory nature. However, this project depended upon a General Plan Amendment and Zone Change and if these were denied by the Planning Commission, the other items would fail because they would be inconsistent with the General Plan and Zoning.

**Commissioner Umeda amended his motion to deny the Adoption of the Mitigated Negative Declaration and the General Amendment based on the finding that the proposed amendment was not internally consistent with the General Plan based on the Planning Commission discussion of the Plan, and therefore Recommendations 3 and 4 could be approved, and Commissioner Sakala seconded the motion, which was approved by a vote of 3-2.**

**Motion by Umeda, seconded by Christianson, and approved by a vote of 4-1 to forward the project to the City Council without prejudice.**

**PC-04-61 - PRECISE PLAN OF DESIGN (PPD) NO. 04-10 AND VARIANCE (VAR) NO. 04-04**

Senior Planner Lamson presented the staff report stating that the project was located on the south side of Mission Road, including and west of the Edison Easement, west of California Street and north of the San Timoteo Creek and the railroad, and was proposing to construct 70 single-family units in a neo-traditional design, which would include more than five acres of park and open space. She added that the Precise Plan of Design (PPD) included the site layout and design of the residences, the landscaping, and related amenities.

Ms. Lamson explained that on May 5, 2004, the Planning Commission recommended Tentative Tract Map No. 16323 for approval for 93 houses and forwarded the project to the City Council and that on June 8, July 13, and July 26, 2004, the City Council reviewed and approved the modified Tentative Tract Map No. 16323 for 70 houses.

Ms. Lamson continued to say that a pocket park would provide a landscaped playground with play equipment for the use of the community, that the Edison Easement would be landscaped with areas of orange groves, turf and a community garden with additional landscaped open space areas maintained by a Homeowners Association (HOA). Ms. Lamson reported that Chinese flame trees, California pepper, camphor, and flowering cherry trees would be placed in the parks and open space areas with a grove of dwarf citrus trees planted in the Edison Easement Park.

Ms. Lamson described the project as having the following characteristics:

- Three one-story and two two-story housing plans, with unique architectural styles, which were modern adaptations of amenities found in traditional styles of architecture historic to the area. Each plan would have a "Craftsman" and a "Victorian" style not intended to be exact replicas of the traditional style but contemporary homes with a traditional character;
- Revised color schemes represented in the color illustrations and the color board;

- Houses ranging from 1,656 to 2,480 square feet with several options to increase the number of rooms and/or bedrooms. The plans offer a variety of home sizes that include two, three, and four bedrooms;
- Landscaping to be provided by the developer for the front yard, parkway, exterior side yard and rear yard area outside the private yard;
- Wrought iron fence material along the parks and open space areas with six-foot high tan vinyl fencing for the interior.

Ms. Lamson explained that due to the sloping topography of the project site, the applicant was requesting a variance to exceed the maximum wall height of six feet along the westerly tract boundary of the lots south of Van Leuven Street and adjacent to the existing single-family homes fronting onto Mission Road. She continued to say that staff had been working with the applicant to modify the grading to reduce the height of a majority of the wall along the westerly boundary of the tract, adjacent to the retaining walls of the existing apartments with the exception of an area around the last three lots to the south of the tract that would exceed the six-foot height.

Ms. Lamson stated that through further analysis, it was also determined that the walls surrounding the two existing single-family homes fronting on Mission Road would also have to exceed six feet in height to ensure that the existing residences would have privacy from the homes on a higher elevation; the wall would not exceed nine feet, and would not be visible from public view. She added that also due to the sloped topography, the applicant would take into consideration the existing street elevations and would ensure that the flow would not create cross-lot drainage. Ms. Lamson stated that the applicant indicated that he could provide written acknowledgements accepting the wall height from these two property owners.

Ms. Lamson informed the Commission that one letter of opposition to the variance was received from Courtney Torino who represented the management company of Monterey Pines, the existing apartment complex to the west of the project. Mr. Torino's main concerns involved the construction of a new wall along the westerly property line and asked that a tract boundary wall be constructed without removing the existing wall on the Monterey Pines property.

John Snell, American Pacific Homes, 4959 Palo Verde, Montclair, CA, stated that they had been working on addressing the concerns that staff and the neighbors had regarding the wall. He added that he had slides that would illustrate the variation in wall that would exceed the six-foot height that would be in the back and side yards and the wall adjacent to the apartment complex.

Larry L. Leas, 25886 Mission Road, Loma Linda, stated that he also owned three condominiums in the Mountain View Gardens and that had concerns about the wall being too close to their property but was somewhat satisfied that the proposed changes would not be as significant as first expected. He commented on the recent rainstorm and his concern was that the developers had the water draining into adjacent properties. He added that he wanted to make sure that the drainage was properly addressed once the construction was completed.

Courtney Torino, 95 Argonaut, Suite 250, Aliso Viejo, CA introduced himself as the president of the Management Company and managing member for ownership of the Monterey Pines, property west of the proposed development. He explained that their issue had to do with the block wall adjacent to their property, but added that staff seemed to have addressed several of those issues. He continued to say that he would like to voice some other minor concerns to make sure that they were not forgotten. He spoke on the following topics: Color of the wall – He would like to see it be compatible with their wall; Additional screening with trees in the rear

yards near the proposed houses; Drainage and grading; Mitigation of the dust during construction because of the stockpiling of dirt that well above the apartment complex wall.

Steve Stand, 27 Flowerbud, Irvine CA, stated that he was an architect for the KTG Y group designing the houses for American Pacific Homes. He clarified that the styles were not meant to be exact replicas but to show traditional styles and character elements of the Victorian and Craftsman styles homes. He pointed out the various elements shown on the renderings supplied to the Planning Commission.

Dick Wiley, 10848 Pepper Way, Loma Linda, CA spoke to the issue of drainage because of the recent abundant rain storm and requested some type of mitigation for run off to drain properly between Pepper Way and the easement. He pointed out on that the east side of Pepper Way was higher than the west side, therefore drainage from Van Leuven changes direction to follow the slope down Pepper Way. Mr. Wiley also asked that the look of the driveways on Silva Court facing Pepper Way be softened with either planters or some stones on a section of the columns. He concluded stating that he like the project.

Georgia Hodgkin, 24360 Lawton Avenue, Loma Linda thanked the Commission for reducing the number of units before the project went before City Council who further reduced the number of units to 70. She added that the houses on Mission Road were causing quite a bit of concern with the community and she hoped that the new project would not have the same look as the Ryland Homes project south of Mission Road.

David Kent, 17992 Mitchell South, Irvine CA stated that he was a principle at KTG Y Architects and congratulated John Snell of American Pacific Homes and his associate Steve Stand for a great project. Mr. Kent explained that they had designed the new homes with articulations on the rear of the houses to allow neighbors and passersby to view a better looking elevations. He also commented that he was very happy with the colors selected for the materials.

John Snell, American Pacific Homes, 4959 Palo Verde, Montclair, CA approached the podium to address some of the concerns that were expressed during the public comment period.

- Dust – They will do dust control using water trucks;
- Block Wall – The wall will be a tan split face wall;
- Drainage – Two issues: 1) Ryland Homes' catch basins not opened so water flows in the street; 2) Pepper Way not developed to full width, and the entire street slopes toward the condominiums. In this project, the developer would slope their side of Pepper Way towards the project and away from the condominiums;
- Window treatment – They will add window treatments so that the homes have a better look from the street;
- Edison Park – The park was redesigned because of Edison's concerns and the design was updated;
- Monterey Pines request for screening or softening – Backyards landscaping are left to be the responsibility of the new owners.

Chair Rosenbaum closed the public comment period at 8:50 p.m. and opened the discussion to the Planning Commission. The Commission deliberated on the following topics:

- Porches – No railing on the Craftsman and Victorian models – Developer is trying the emulate the historic look of those styles and will work with staff and the applicant to address the issue;

- Front doors on the Victorian Model – Solid construction if possible, with the a glass insert as an upgrade feature;
- Victorian siding/sprayed on stucco – Will give the Victorian a smooth finish to emulate more closely the style of the Victorian;

Mr. Snell explained that Mr. Silva had requested that the street named after him be called "Silva Ranch Road" and Mr. Snell didn't know what the procedure was to change the name of the street. Director Woldruff replied that the street names had already been approved by the City Council.

Mr. Snell also had a question regarding the approval of the PPD and pointed out that staff's recommendation was to forward to City Council. Director Woldruff replied that the recommendation would be changed because the PPDs were approved at the Planning Commission level.

The Planning Commission commended the applicant and the developer for taking a serious look at what the community wanted in regards to architecture and planning.

Chair Rosenbaum requested clarification in regards to the development standards in the PC document pertaining to the number of bedrooms for the two-story models. Mr. Snell replied that he would add the "minimum of" to clarify the statement. He added that he would work with staff to revise the document so it reflects the approved project conditions as directed by the Planning Commission.

Chair Rosenbaum also had questions on the following items:

- Placement of the one-story homes for the two homes on Silva Court closest to Mission Road off of Pepper Lane and along Sinclair Circle next to the Edison Easement – Mr. Snell replied that there wasn't enough room to place the three single-story houses on those lots and added that the best placement for those models would be on the corner of the streets and that the landscaping from the Edison Easement would help to soften the look of the two-story homes;
- Fencing – Provide better and more decorative fencing along Pepper with landscape to shield the fence;
- Benches – Mr. Snell replied that the Edison Company would not allow the placement of benches in the easement.

**Motion by Sakala, seconded by Christianson, and unanimously carried to approve Precise Plan of Design No. 04-10 and Variance No. 04-04 based on the Findings and subject to the Conditions of Approval.**

#### **REPORTS BY PLANNING COMMISSIONERS**

No reports were presented.

#### **REPORT BY THE DIRECTOR OF COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT**

Director Woldruff reported that the City Council was reviewing the Draft General Plan and had established a schedule to systematically address the various Elements. She added that there would be a joint City Council/Planning Commission on January 11, 2005.



**ADJOURNMENT**

**Motion by Rosenbaum, seconded by Christianson, and unanimously carried to adjourn the meeting.**

The meeting was adjourned at 9:25 p.m.

Minutes approved at the meeting of June 28, 2006.

---

Administrative Secretary

*I:\PlanningCom (PC)\PC 2004\Minutes\04Nov17SM-app.doc*